

VU Research Portal

What Can Be Done Against Public Corruption and Fraud. Expert Views on Strategies to Protect Public Integrity

Huberts, L.W.J.C.

published in

Crime, Law and Social Change
1998

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Huberts, L. W. J. C. (1998). What Can Be Done Against Public Corruption and Fraud. Expert Views on Strategies to Protect Public Integrity. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, (29), 209-224.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl



What can be done against public corruption and fraud: Expert views on strategies to protect public integrity

L.W.J.C. HUBERTS

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract. A number of questions dominate the debate about public corruption and fraud. First of all, of course, there is the question of the content of these phenomena. What is corruption, what is fraud and how is it related to power abuse and public waste? Some scholars stress that these questions are unanswerable if ethnocentrism is to be avoided. Others are more positive about the possibility to grasp the central meaning of the concepts. A second type of questions has to do with understanding public corruption and fraud. To define a concept is something; to understand it is something different. Understanding means knowing the causes and consequences. To be able to understand it, corruption should be given a place in the framework of knowledge about public structure, culture and behavior. This is all but a simple endeavor because it will make a difference which theoretical and methodological framework is chosen as a starting point. This article seeks to avoid this obstacle by choosing an approach which could be categorized as pragmatic and eclectic, trying to discover whether there are causes which are seen as important by a variety of experts with different academical and occupational backgrounds: is there a common core present in different approaches? Third, there is the normative debate. What are the positive and negative consequences of corruption and fraud and how can cost and benefits be compared and judged? Nowadays, most scholars and practitioners in the field stress the negative consequences of public corruption and fraud. Such a critical attitude almost automatically leads to a fourth type of debate, about the question “what to do about it?”. Which methods and strategies are thinkable and what works? This subject is the central one in this article.¹

Introduction

The article is based on the results of a survey in which 257 experts from 49 countries participated in 1994. What are the expert views on strategies to protect public integrity and to combat corruption in a country? First, the central concepts are defined. Second, some information is presented about the extent of the corruption and fraud problem in different parts of the world and about the causal conditions which are important in the eyes of the expert panel. Third, twenty-one methods to combat corruption are presented and they are used to construct a typology of strategies. Economic, educational, cultural, organizational, political and judicial strategies to combat public corruption and fraud can be distinguished.

A number of the methods and strategies are considered to be effective by experts living in countries with very different political and societal conditions. When the results are formulated in terms of policy recommendations, the following picture arises. In poorer as well as in richer countries, creating commitment and awareness of leading politicians and public officials should have priority. Their involvement should result in more transparency in party politics as well as in improving the organization of the public service. Improving integrity in business-state relationships and combatting organized crime are also important. For lower income countries, these anti corruption initiatives should be combined with developmental policies. Good governance and economic and social development cannot be separated.

Lastly the expert views are confronted with a number of international initiatives and developments. The results support the ideas behind international initiatives like Transparency International. In order to decrease the amount of corruption, a conglomerate of strategies and methods should be applied (economic, educational, cultural, organizational, political and judicial measures). At the same time scepticism is appropriate. 'What is said' by politicians and countries differs from 'what is done' in actual policies. There is a general tendency to point at others. Richer countries point at developing countries, developing countries reject interference and point at industrialized countries which are not willing to take anti corruption measures which might harm their companies and economies. What will actually happen will be decided upon during the next years.

Method of survey

The paper is primarily based on the results of an international expert survey which was organized in 1994 (Huberts, 1996). 257 respondents from 49 countries answered questions about public corruption and fraud, about the conditions which cause these violations of public integrity and about the methods and strategies which are considered effective to combat public corruption and fraud. This panel of experts represents different countries and different occupational backgrounds. 75 respondents are from Western Europe, 4 from Eastern Europe, 65 from Asia, 14 from Oceania, 55 from North America, 37 from Latin America and 7 from Africa. Among them are scientists (38%), representatives from the police and the judiciary (28%), from the civil service and anti corruption agencies (12%), auditors, comptrollers, accountants (10%) and businessmen and consultants (8%). Additionally 'higher income countries' and 'lower income countries' are distinguished on the basis of the GNP per capita (United Nations Development Programme, 1994: 224): does the GNP per capita exceed \$6,000 (higher income country) or is

it \$6,000 or below (lower income country).² 190 panel participants are from the higher income and 67 from the lower income countries.

An inventory of the views of experts brings information which has to be seen in a proper context. All data are the result of opinions, estimations and guesses by respondents. By selecting specific respondents, these opinions and guesses are considered to be ‘expert’ opinions and ‘educated’ guesses but it must not be forgotten that the survey is concerned with opinion research. The research is not about actual cases of corruption and fraud in a country, but about views on corruption and fraud from experts in the field. Views say something about reality but they must not be confounded with it.

Concepts

The chosen perspective is all but original. It is derived from the work of eminent scholars like Friedrich, Huntington and Nye. Friedrich spoke of corruption when “a responsible functionary or office holder, is by monetary or other rewards (...) induced to take actions which favor whoever provides the reward and thereby damage the group or organization to which the functionary belongs, more specifically the government” (1989: 15), Huntington defined corruption as “behavior of public officials which deviates from accepted norms in order to serve private ends” (1989: 377) and Nye as “behavior which deviates from the formal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (family, close private clique), pecuniary or status gains; or violates rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence” (1989: 966). Choosing a rather narrow interpretation of corruption is not identical to neglecting the existence of power abuse and government waste in a broader sense.³ In relation to the definition, public functionaries are *corrupt* when they act (or do not act) as a result of the personal rewards offered to them by interested outside private actors. Public *fraud* is private gain at public expense, damaging the group or organization to which the functionary belongs, without the involvement of external beneficiaries. Corruption and fraud both mean the *misuse of public power for private gain* (including gain for one’s own family, group or party). When public corruption or fraud is committed by politicians, it is called political corruption or fraud; when civil servants are involved, it is administrative corruption or fraud.

Public corruption and fraud can be considered as forms of misuse of public power: the (non)action or (non)decision of a politician or civil servant is related to private instead of public interests. *Public integrity* stands for acting and deciding according the prevailing norms for public behavior and one of the most accepted norms is that private interests should not interfere with political and administrative responsibilities. It is obvious that such an inter-

Table 1. Expert panel's views about the extent of public corruption and fraud.

	n	Politicians		Public servants	
		median	mean	median	mean
Western Europe	75	5.0%	10.2%	5.0%	6.5%
Eastern Europe	4	10.0%	15.1%	15.0%	22.9%
Asia	65	25.0%	32.3%	15.0%	22.1%
Oceania	14	5.0%	10.5%	4.5%	9.3%
North America	55	13.0%	22.5%	5.0%	11.3%
Latin America	37	40.0%	45.2%	33.0%	37.3%
Africa	7	60.0%	48.6%	50.0%	47.9%
Total		10.0%	25.2%	10.0%	18.0%

pretation means that corruption and fraud are associated with certain types of public pathologies and not with power abuse by public authorities in general. Such a narrow perspective is suited for comparative research because it is relatively clear to all respondents. This is illustrated by the fact that in almost all countries laws exist against this specific type of power abuse.⁴

Understanding public corruption and fraud

Extent

In the expert panel survey, several questions were aimed at obtaining information on the extent of the public corruption and fraud problem. Firstly, the respondents were asked which countries they consider to belong to the three most corrupt in the world. With the exception of Oceania, all parts of the world are represented in the 'top 15' of the most corrupt countries in the world. This illustrates that public corruption and fraud are among the problems of a global nature. The countries which are mentioned most often as the most corrupt countries in the world are (in this order): Italy, Russia, Nigeria, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, China, Japan, Zaire and Indonesia.

The members of the panel were also asked to estimate the percentage of corrupt or fraudulent politicians and civil servants in their *own country*. As might be expected, the percentages mentioned by respondents from different parts of the world differ enormously (Table 1). Experts from Western Europe and Oceania estimate that 5% of their politicians are corrupt or fraudulent, while the percentage for Latin America is 40%.

Africa, Latin America and, to a slightly lesser degree, Asia are viewed as the continents where a large portion of the politicians and public servants commits corrupt or fraudulent acts. Western Europe and Oceania are considered as the parts of the world where public corruption and fraud exist on a relatively small scale. On the other hand corruption and fraud appear to be an underestimated problem in those parts of the world too. An estimated percentage in Western Europe of 5% corruption and fraud among politicians (average: 10.5%) and an estimated average of 5% for civil servants (average 6.5%) should hardly give reason to indifference.

The differences between parts of the world already point at the direct relationship that exists between a country's wealth and its public corruption and fraud. Panel members from higher income countries estimate 7.5% of their politicians and 5.0% of their public servants to be corrupt while the figures for the lower income countries are 40% and 34%.

Further research will have to clarify whether 'income' has to be considered as the central factor to explain the level of public corruption and fraud. The presented data are convincing that there exists a relationship between the two variables but it is not clear whether this relationship is of a causal nature.⁵

Lower income countries experience a lot of corruption and fraud but experts from these countries consider other social and political problems more important. Among an abundance of problems, corruption does not get a high priority. In contrast with that, the experts in higher income countries believe public corruption and fraud to be among the most serious problems their countries are confronted with, although they view corruption and fraud as problems of low frequency.

Public and private

There is an important difference between the lower and higher income countries concerning the prominence of corruption in the public or government sector compared to the *business or market sector* (Table 2). A large portion of the respondents from the lower income countries, 42.4%, is convinced of the prominence of corruption and fraud in the public sector. Only 9.1% believe that the scale of corruption and fraud in the business sector exceeds corruption and fraud in the public sector. Of the respondents who live in higher income countries, 17.6% believe corruption and fraud to be most prominent in the public sector, while 44.5% view corruption as most pronounced in the business sector.

Table 2. Prominence of corruption in business and public sector.

	> in public sector	> in business sector	equally prominent
World panel	24.2%	35.1%	40.7%
Higher income countries	17.6%	44.5%	37.9%
Lower income countries	42.4%	9.1%	48.5%

Causes

Which social, economic, political, organizational and individual factors are responsible for the existence of public corruption and fraud? How important are 20 selected causes of corruption and fraud in different parts of the world? According to the experts a conglomerate of causal factors is important to explain cases of public corruption and fraud in their country. Table 3 shows which 10 cases the experts from higher and lower income countries consider most important.

Not surprisingly, some factors which are related to developmental problems are considered as more important by respondents from the lower income countries than by experts for richer countries. These factors are “social inequality”, “low salaries in the public sector” and “economic problems: inflation/recession”. The simple message in this respect is that policies against poverty and underdevelopment will also contribute to the establishment of more integrity in the public sector.

At the same time, there appears to be much more agreement than expected between the experts. The three most important causes are identical for higher and lower income countries, while most of the other most important causes of corruption in higher income countries are important in lower income countries as well. In all parts of the world, rich or poor, corruption and fraud are associated with the values and norms of individual politicians and civil servants, with the lack of commitment to public integrity of leadership, with organizational problems and failures (lack of control and supervision and mismanagement), with the relationship between the public sector and business and with the increasing strength of organized crime. This finding supports the reliability of the view that the phenomenon is of a general character. The *misuse of public power for private gain* is present in poorer and richer countries and the prominence of corruption and fraud is everywhere related to a number of specific characteristics.

Table 3. Importance of causes of public corruption and fraud.

Factors	Important cause (%, ranking)			
	higher income country (n=190)		lower income country (n=67)	
• norms and values politicians and public servants	88.4%	1	98.4%	1
• lack of control, supervision, auditing	87.2%	2	93.3%	2
• interrelationships-business, politics, state	86.6%	3	92.9%	3
• values and norms concerning government/state	84.6%	4	79.7%	11
• public sector culture (values/norms)	83.3%	5	76.8%	12
• lack of commitment of leadership	82.2%	6	90.2%	5
• misorganization and mismanagement	80.7%	7	91.9%	4
• increasing strength of organized crime	79.3%	8	90.0%	7
• norms and values on private and public	78.0%	9	73.7%	14
• increasing significance of lobbying	76.5%	10	72.9%	15
• interrelationships-politics and administration	67.0%	11	86.4%	9
• social inequality	66.7%	12	90.2%	6
• low salaries in the public sector	56.9%	16	87.1%	8
• economic problems (inflation/recession)	62.2%	14	85.2%	10

What to do

What is done to combat corruption and fraud and how effective are the strategies which are applied? The expert panel is not very satisfied with government policies to combat corruption and fraud (Table 4). This applies to the higher income countries (52.7%) as well as to the lower income countries (59.7%). Remarkably, members from Western Europe are among the most skeptical: 63.0% state that there is no government policy or that the policy is a total or partial failure. The other panel members are somewhat less negative. 54.5% are critical and 45.5% think the policy is moderately or even very successful.

What strategies should be enacted to create a successful policy in order to combat corruption and fraud. 21 methods to combat the phenomenon were distinguished, based on an inventory of the literature (Alatas [1990]; Benaissa [1993]; Caiden [1988]; Heidenheimer, Johnston and Levine [1989]; Hoetjes [1982]; Van den Hoff [1992]; Klitgaard [1988]; Ruimschotel [1993]; Wertheim and Brasz [1960]). In the questionnaire the methods were put forward in an aselect sequence.

Table 4. Success of government policy.

Policy	Western Europe	North America	Oceania	Latin America	Asia	World
no policy	26.0%	7.4%	14.3%	10.8%	18.8%	17.0%
(partial) failure	37.0%	38.9%	14.3%	45.9%	34.4%	37.5%
(moderately) successful	37.0%	53.7%	71.4%	43.2%	46.9%	45.5%

The expert views on anti-corruption methods are of course closely connected with the importance the respondents attributed to the different causes of corruption and fraud.

Table 5 summarizes the results for the whole panel as well as for the experts from lower and higher income countries. The methods are categorized within the different strategies that can be distinguished. A number of methods cannot be attributed to only one strategy and they can be found as part of different strategies. Six strategies are distinguished.⁶

The *economic* strategy emphasizes the necessity to diminish the financial and economic stimuli for fraud and corruption. Different methods belong to this strategy: an “economic policy that enables people a reasonable standard of living”, “paying higher salaries to politicians and public servants”, reorganizing the relationship between the economy and the state by “less government/privatizing public policies” and “making banking and finance more transparent”. The *educational* (or cultural/communicative) strategy aims at changing the attitudes and values of the population as well as public servants by raising the attention being paid to the problem and through training and education (“information campaigns to inform and mobilize the public”, “more public exposure” (“media report and public investigation”, “changing attitudes among the population concerning the obligation to serve one’s own family”, “influencing the attitude of public servants by training”). Related to the educational strategy are methods meant to influence political and bureaucratic culture. This public *culture* strategy includes “improving the example given by management (ethical standards set at the top)” and “developing and applying a code of ethics for politicians and civil servants”. Related to culture as well as structure is the factor “better protection of people who report improper activities (whistle blowers)”.

The *organizational* (or bureaucratic) strategy involves “improving internal control and supervision (including auditing systems)”, “stronger selection of public personnel (on the criteria: honesty and capability)” and “rotation of personnel functionally and geographically”.

Table 5. Expert panel views on effectiveness of 21 anti corruption methods (percentage of respondents considering the method (very) effective).

Strategy	Higher income country (190)	Lower income country (67)	World panel (257)
Economic			
reasonable standard of living	50.0%	85.2%	58.8%
higher salaries politicians/public servants	34.4%	73.0%	44.2%
less government/privatizing	27.9%	62.5%	36.2%
making banking and finance more transparent	69.9%	78.7%	71.9%
Educational			
information campaigns (public)	71.6%	85.0%	74.9%
more public exposure	76.6%	82.0%	78.0%
changing family attitudes population	37.1%	68.9%	45.2%
influencing attitude of public servants	76.8%	82.3%	78.1%
Public culture			
example given by management at the top	80.0%	85.0%	81.2%
code of ethics for politicians and civil servants	73.1%	76.2%	73.9%
better protection for whistle blowers	74.2%	78.7%	75.3%
Organizational/bureaucratic			
rotation of personnel	51.6%	55.0%	52.4%
internal control and supervision	86.5%	96.9%	89.2%
stronger selection of public personnel	73.2%	91.9%	78.0%
Political			
more commitment by politicians	86.9%	88.5%	87.3%
transparency party finances	80.3%	96.8%	84.5%
example given by management at the top	80.0%	85.0%	81.2%
more rigorous separation of public powers	48.4%	74.6%	55.1%
less government/privatizing	27.9%	62.5%	36.2%
Repressive/judicial			
more severe penal sanctions	64.2%	82.8%	68.9%
extension of police and judiciary	57.1%	72.1%	60.9%
creating independent institutions	75.1%	87.1%	78.1%
combatting organized crime	77.3%	86.9%	79.8%
making banking and finance more transparent	69.6%	78.7%	71.9%

Political actors play a central role in the *political* strategy to combat corruption. Elements are “more commitment by politicians to combat corruption and fraud”, “more openness/transparency political party finances” and “improving the example given by management (ethical standards set at the top)”. The structure of the political system is important as well. “More rigorous separation of public powers (legislature, executive, judiciary)” might help to diminish corruption as well as “less government /privatizing public policies”.

The last strategy includes *judicial* or repressive measures. “More severe penal sanctions” might help as well as the “extension of the police and judicial capabilities” and “independent institutions against corruption (to inform, investigate, prosecute)”. Law is also important in “making banking and finance more transparent (less discretion and privacy)”. Of course, this strategy also includes “combatting and decreasing organized crime” which might decrease the attempts to corrupt politicians and public servants (including the police).

All twenty-one methods which were distinguished are considered as more effective by the experts from lower income countries than by their colleagues from richer countries. The logic behind this is clear: when the problem is as widespread as it is in lower income countries, all kinds of initiatives are considered to be helpful to decrease the problem. This points at the necessity to develop an overall strategy with economic, educational, cultural, organizational, political as well as repressive elements.

A number of methods are only of importance for lower income countries. As might be expected this is true for methods which concentrate on economic development, on better salaries for public functionaries and on changing peoples attitudes concerning family obligations. More surprising, experts from lower income countries stress the importance of “more openness/transparency political party finances”, “more rigorous separation of public powers (legislature, executive, judiciary)”, “stronger selection of public personnel (on the criteria: honesty and capability)”, “more severe penal sanctions” and the “extension of the police and judicial capabilities”.

Agreement between experts from lower and higher income countries exists about the importance of elements of political and organizational methods (Table 6). More commitment by politicians, more openness/transparency of political party finances and improving internal control and supervision (including auditing systems) are seen by all experts as very effective methods. There is also considerable agreement about the effectiveness of influencing the attitude of public servants, improving the example given by management and combatting organized crime.

The expert panel view on strategies is in agreement with its opinion about the causes of public corruption and fraud but one point might be added. Among the important causes the relationship between business and the state

Table 6. Most effective strategies against public corruption and fraud.

Methods	Effectiveness	
	Higher income country (190)	Lower income country (67)
More commitment by politicians	1	4
Internal control and supervision	2	1
Transparency party finances	3	2
Example given by management at the top	4	8
Influencing attitude of public servants	5	11
Combatting organized crime	6	6
More public exposure	7	8
Creating independent institutions	8	5
Stronger selection of public personnel	10	3
Reasonable standard of living	17	7

plays an important role while this aspect is absent in the selected strategies (although it is related to “making banking and finance more transparent”). This means that specific measures directed at more integrity and transparency in the relations between business and the state (which includes lobbying activities) might have to be added to the list of strategies which are considered effective by the expert panel.

Conclusion and discussion

Different interpretations of the presented survey research results are possible but some initial conclusions may be drawn focussing on the experts views on strategies to combat corruption; in particular a general conclusion about the panel view on the effectiveness of different strategies and their relationship to the actual international discussion about corruption and fraud.

Strategy

An international strategy to combat public corruption and fraud should take into account the differences as well as the similarities between countries. In general, creating commitment and awareness of leading politicians and public officials should have priority. Their involvement should result in more transparency in party politics as well as in the improvement of the organization

of the public service. Improving integrity in business-state relationships and combatting organized crime are also important in lower as well as in higher income countries. For lower income countries, these anti-corruption initiatives should be combined with developmental policies. Good governance and economic and social development cannot be separated. At the same time poverty cannot be an excuse to do nothing against corruption and fraud.

International discussion

The international discussion about public corruption and fraud underlines the dilemma's and paradoxes in dealing with corruption. These concern the relationship between 'what is said' and 'what is done' and the tendency to point at others when causes and solutions are discussed. On the one hand it is clear that all *countries, rich and poor, democratic and non democratic*, have to deal with the public corruption and fraud problem. It is also clear that the problem is back on many national and international political and administrative agendas: "around the globe, near and far, an unprecedented surge of civic housecleaning is attacking the black plague of governmental corruption" (Church, 1996: 36). On the other hand, it is justified to doubt the results of the housecleaning in terms of cleanness and transparency. Few policies are actually discussed, let alone implemented.

On the one hand more governments of *industrialized countries* show that they realize that corruption and fraud can endanger the legitimacy of their political systems. On the other hand the initiatives of western industrialized states directed at the protection of public integrity primarily point at poorer countries, combining the subject with trade agreement negotiations and developmental aid. These initiatives lack credibility as long as these countries are not critical about their own integrity and as long as they remain passive concerning the role of their own multinational companies and organizations in corruption and fraud elsewhere: it is not 'Western ethnocentrism' which is the main problem, much more important is 'Western egoism'.

It is acknowledged that a lot of lower income countries are tragically infected by the corruption virus but *developing countries* strongly argue that developmental aid should not be connected with the integrity and effectiveness of the state, only with the effect of the subsidized program. In their Communiqué of April 21, 1996, the ministers of the Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four on International Monetary Affairs criticized industrial countries for promoting good governance and civil society issues in relation to the Multilateral Development Bank: "Ministers expressed serious concerns about the use of environmental, governance, human rights, labor standards, or other issues to further protectionist interests in industrial countries". However, it is clear that the state is directly and indirectly involved in development

processes. This makes it understandable that third world countries are confronted with their public corruption and fraud problem; it seems to make little sense to invest in the development of a society which is characterized by widespread corruption and lack of governmental willingness to curb corruption and to contribute to greater clarity and integrity in politics and public administration; there cannot be that much wrong in trying to stimulate that type of 'good governance'.

While politicians often stress the importance of public integrity and anti-corruption policies, they do not always include their own sector in their analysis. The expert views on the importance of transparency of political party finances point at the necessity to include the *political sector* in a reform strategy to protect public integrity. Redesigning government to protect public integrity should have implications for public servants and the administrative system but it should also have consequences for politicians and the political party system. These consequences are – to put it euphemistically – not always the first thing politicians think about when they discuss public sector integrity.

Skepticism about the actual discussion of public corruption and fraud in international relations and international fora seems appropriate. The subject is almost exclusively discussed in the context of financial relations and developmental aid. This is in contrast with what could be done in international as well as national politics and administration. A lot of *ideas and plans* about combatting public corruption and fraud are available and it is worth noting a number of ideas and initiatives:

- In order to protect public integrity and to combat corruption effectively, a mixture of strategies and methods is necessary. Economic, educational, cultural, organizational, political and judicial methods should be considered. This also means that it is important that different organizations and institutions get involved. The judicial system and the media, for example, were of crucial importance in making corruption a public and political issue in countries like Italy and Colombia. At the international level a number of *institutions* which have played a major role in promoting and implementing anti corruption strategies within national states are weak or missing. Strengthening these institutions (such as the International Court of Justice) seems of utmost importance for the world-wide struggle against public corruption and fraud.
- International fora like the World Bank and the United Nations should not hesitate to continue to make public integrity an important aspect of their work. This is true for their relations with *lower as well as higher* income countries. Much more can be done against public corruption. However, the credibility of international anti-corruption initiatives depends upon the will to tackle the problem at all levels. The mentioned fora should

stimulate anti-corruption policies in all countries including issues of integrity of the national political and administrative system of lower and higher income countries and policies of all countries towards companies and organizations involved in corruption in other countries.

- Ethics and integrity in the public sector cannot be analyzed without taking into account the relation between the state and the business sector. Important changes have occurred in these relations during the last decades and these changes should also be judged on the basis of the integrity criterium. Strategies aimed at less government and *privatizing* public services seem unsuited in higher income countries. In the rich world, business is considered to be more corrupt than government and privatizing thus would stimulate and not limit corruption: to put it bluntly, 'the market is not the solution, it is part of the problem'. For lower income countries the opposite is true. As long as public corruption is omnipresent, privatizing services can contribute to the anti corruption struggle.
- *Transparency International* more or less embodies the hope for an intensification of the anti corruption struggle. TI has stimulated debate as well as policy development. Comprehensible multi-level strategies are possible, as the TI Source Book shows (Pope, 1996). A coherent, *comprehensive strategy* is sketched, while the Source Book "flags five main areas of reform which can help implement an overall anti-corruption strategy – public programs, government reorganization, law enforcement, public awareness, and, the creation of institutions to prevent corruption" (Pope, 1996: x). It is promising that a number of national TI chapters have been established and these national organizations can exert pressure on national governments to change their international as well as national policies.
- The 'challenges for public administration in the twenty-first century' in order to protect its integrity are clear. At the same time the paradoxes make it very unclear what will actually happen. Two developments are thinkable, which will be decided upon during these years. It is possible that the 'surge of civic housecleaning' will prove to be temporary upheaval of attention for the public integrity issue, without consequences for the public structure and culture. Some say corruption is not that widespread as suggested, others stress there that the consequences are not that negative and some are convinced that nothing can be done about corruption. In another scenario, however, the issue will not disappear but it will achieve a respectable place on the public, political and scientific agenda. Public integrity will – in that vision – become an aspect of national and international government which will take its place besides

other important criteria. For public administration *effectivity and efficiency* always have been and always will be important. For a democratic government and administration *legitimacy* is crucial as well. People must be able to participate in decision-making and government policies must be acceptable to the public. To these criteria *integrity* can be added. Politicians and public servants are – and should be – expected to operate in accordance with explicit ethical standards.

Notes

1. The article summarizes the main results a expert survey organized by the author. Special attention is paid to expert views on possible strategies to combat public corruption. The results of the panel survey were published in “Expert views on public corruption around the globe” (Huberts, 1996). An analysis of the results on Europe can be found in Huberts (1995). The article was presented as a paper at the 5th international conference on Ethics in the Public Service, Brisbane, 1996.
2. This means that the panel respondents from Western Europe, North America, Oceania, Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea and Israel are the representatives of the higher income countries and the experts from Africa (Benin, Cameroon, Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria, Zimbabwe), Latin America (e.g. Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Panama) and Asia (e.g. India, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey) as representatives of the lower income countries.
3. For clarification about concepts and approaches, see also Gardiner, 1993; Johnston (1993).
4. Because of this relation with legal provisions, the chosen interpretation of corruption and fraud is often called ‘legalistic’.
5. The income of a country is for example directly related with political system characteristics, e.g. with the score on political democracy. Further research is necessary to find out how democracy, wealth and corruption are related. Will more income bring more democracy and less corruption or will more democracy lead to more wealth and less corruption?
6. Another typology and a description of changes in anti-corruption strategy in the United States is to be found in Anechiarico & Jacobs (1994).

References

- S.H. Alatas (1990) *Corruption: Its nature, causes and functions*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- F. Anechiarico and J.B. Jacobs (1994) Visions of corruption control and the evolution of American public administration. *Public Administration Review* 54, nr. 5: 465–473.
- H. Benaissa (1993) Corruption and the socio-cultural context, In M. Punch et al., *Coping with corruption in a borderless world*. Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers (etc.), Deventer (etc.), pp. 59–75.
- G.E. Caiden (1988) Toward a general theory of official corruption. *Asian Journal of Public Administration* 10 (1): 3–26.
- G.E. Caiden (1994) Dealing with administrative corruption. In Terry L. Cooper (ed.), *Handbook of administrative ethics*. New York (etc.): Marcel Dekker, pp. 305–322.
- G.J. Church (1996) War against sleaze, *Time*, May, pp. 36–42.

- C.J. Friedrich (1989) Corruption concepts in historical perspective. In A.J. Heidenheimer, M. Johnston and V.T. Levine (eds.), *Political Corruption. A Handbook*. New Brunswick (etc.): Transaction Publishers, pp. 15–24.
- J.A. Gardiner (1993). Defining corruption. In M. Punch et al., *Coping with corruption in a borderless world*. Deventer (etc.): Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers (etc.), pp. 21–38.
- A.J. Heidenheimer, M. Johnston and V.T. Levine (eds.) (1989) *Political Corruption. A Handbook*. New Brunswick (etc.); Transaction Publishers.
- B.J.S. Hoetjes (1982) *Corruptie bij de overheid. Een bestuurlijk en politiek probleem, sociaal-wetenschappelijk beschouwd*. 's-Gravenhage: VUGA.
- C.M. van den Hoff (1992) Preventie van corruptie en fraude: taak van het overheidsmanagement. In L.W.J.C. Huberts (red.), *Bestuurlijke corruptie en fraude in Nederland*, Arnhem: Gouda Quint, pp. 113–142.
- L.W.J.C. Huberts (1995) Western Europe and public corruption. Expert views on attention, extent and strategies. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 3 (2): 7–20.
- L.W.J.C. Huberts (1996) *Expert views on public corruption around the globe. Research report on the views of an International Expert Panel*. Amsterdam: PSPA.
- S.P. Huntington (1989) Modernization and corruption. In A.J. Heidenheimer, M. Johnston and V.T. Levine (eds.), *Political Corruption. A Handbook*. New Brunswick (etc.): Transaction Publishers, pp. 377–388.
- M. Johnston (1993) Corruption as a process. In M. Punch et al., *Coping with corruption in a borderless world*. Deventer (etc.): Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers (etc.), pp. 39–57.
- R. Klitgaard (1988) *Controlling corruption*. Berkeley (etc.): University of California Press.
- J.S. Nye (1989) Corruption and political development. A cost-benefit analysis. In A.J. Heidenheimer, M. Johnston and V.T. Levine (eds.), *Political Corruption. A Handbook*. New Brunswick (etc.): Transaction Publishers, pp. 963–983 (orig. 1967).
- J. Pope (ed.) (1996) *National integrity systems: The TI source book*. Berlin: Transparency International.
- M. Punch, E. Kolthoff, K. van der Vijver and B. van Vliet (eds.) (1993) *Coping with corruption in a borderless world. Proceedings of the Fifth International Anti-Corruption Conference*. Deventer (etc.): Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers (etc.).
- D. Ruimschotel (1993) *Corruptie en fraude in Nederland*, Arnhem: Gouda Quint/Stichting Maatschappij en Politie.
- Transparency International (1996) *Sharpening the responses against global corruption*. Transparency International Report 1996. Berlin: Transparency International.
- United Nations Development Programme (1994) *Human Development Report 1994*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- W.F. Wertheim and H.J. Brasz (1961) *Corruptie*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

L.W.J.C. Huberts is Professor in Police Studies and Criminal Justice and lecturer in Public Administration at the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam in the Netherlands. His research concerns political, administrative and police power and power abuse (incl. corruption and fraud). He is author or editor of books on influence on governmental policy, on social movements, on metropolitan area government and on public corruption and fraud.